

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION**

<b>CORE WIRELESS LICENSING S.A.R.L.,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:12-CV-100</b>
	)	
<b>vs.</b>	)	<b>JURY TRIAL DEMAND</b>
	)	
<b>APPLE INC.,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendant.</b>	)	

**PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE REGARDING PROGRESS IN LIMITING  
THE NUMBER OF CLAIM TERMS TO BE CONSTRUED**

Core Wireless would like to bring to the attention of the Court progress made by the parties in limiting the number of disputed claim terms since the filing of the parties' Joint Submission to Construe More Than 10 Claims on Monday, June 17, 2013 (Doc. No. 105). In that submission, Core Wireless reported that there were at that time 32 disputed claim terms, including 9 non-means-plus function terms and 23 means-plus-function terms in which the parties had not come to agreement on the corresponding structures. Core Wireless stated its expectation that the parties would be able to resolve their differences on a number of these disputes, and for that reason requested that the Court agree to construe 20 claim terms.

Since Monday, the parties have come to agreement on the construction of one non-means-plus function claim term. Moreover, in order to streamline the case further and to reduce the number of claim construction disputes, Core Wireless is electing to withdraw without prejudice its assertion of infringement of claim 30 of U.S. Patent No. 6,697,347. This moots the parties' dispute regarding 6 means-plus-function terms.

Thus, the currently disputed terms comprise a dispute over the meaning of 8 non-means-plus-function terms and a dispute over the corresponding structures of 17 means-plus-function terms, for a total of 25 claim construction disputes.

The parties are continuing to negotiate their differences over the remaining terms with an eye toward limiting the total number of disputed terms to 20 or less. Core Wireless expects further progress to be made and will apprise the Court of any such progress that the parties are able to make.

Dated: June 19, 2013

Respectfully Submitted,

By: /s/ Craig Y. Allison

Henry Bunsow (California State Bar # 60707)  
Denise M. De Mory (California State Bar #168076)  
Brian A.E. Smith (California State Bar # 188147)  
Craig Y. Allison (California State Bar # 161175)  
**BUNSOW DE MORY SMITH & ALLISON LLP**  
55 Francisco Street, Suite 600  
San Francisco, CA 94133  
Telephone: (415) 426-4747  
Facsimile: (415) 426-4744  
Email: hbunsow@bdiplaw.com  
Email: ddemory@bdiplaw.com  
Email: bsmith@bdiplaw.com  
Email: callison@bdiplaw.com

Wesley Hill  
State Bar No. 24032294  
E-mail: wh@wsfirm.com  
T. John Ward, Jr.  
State Bar No. 00794818  
E-mail: jw@wsfirm.com  
**WARD & SMITH LAW FIRM**  
P.O. Box 1231  
1127 Judson Rd., Ste. 220  
Longview, Texas 75606-1231  
(903) 757-6400 (telephone)  
(903) 757-2323 (facsimile)

**ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF**  
**CORE WIRELESS LICENSING S.A.R.L.**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was filed electronically in compliance with Local Rule CV-5(a). Therefore, this document was served on all counsel who are deemed to have consented to electronic service. Local Rule CV-5(a)(3)(A). Pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 5(d) and Local Rule CV-5(e), all other counsel of record not deemed to have consented to electronic service were served with a true and correct copy of this document via email, facsimile and/or U.S. First Class Mail.

Dated: June 19, 2013

/s/ Craig Y. Allison

Craig Y. Allison